DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 040 CS 502 756

AUTHOR Olsen, Judith E.
TITLE The Relationship between Sex-Role Stereotyping in TV Programming and Children's Autonomy.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; *Childhood Attitudes; Elementary Education; Individualism; *Individual Power; Modeling (Psychological); *Programing (Broadcast); Role Models; Self Actualization; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Socialization; *Television; Television Research; Television Viewing

ABSTRACT

Six classes with 20 students per class participated in a study to determine the effects of television programing's stereotyped images on children's autonomy (independence of thought and action). Classes of first and second grade students and two classes of fifth grade students were the experimental groups, while the third and sixth grade classes served as control groups. A pretest, the Games and Activities Checklist, was used to control the number of subjects both high and low in sex-role stereotyping. The experimental subjects observed videotapes of either traditional or nontraditional female television characters. The Children's Dependency Scale was used as the posttest. The results supported three of six hypotheses that were proposed: boys got significantly higher scores on the autonomy scale than girls; fifth grade students scored higher for autonomy than first and second grade children; and fifth grade students who observed nontraditional female roles scored higher than children in other age or treatment groups. The hypotheses that were not supported were that higher scores would occur for children in the nontraditional setting, for boys observing the nontraditional roles, and for fifth grade boys. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180040

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPING IN TV PROGRAMMING AND CHILDREN'S AUTONOMY

by

Judith E. Olsen
Department of Information Sciences
114 Stevenson Hall
Normal, Illinois

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Judith E. Olsen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS502756

A paper presented to the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, SanAntonio, Texas, November 10-13, 1979.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPING IN TV PROGRAMMING AND CHILDREN'S AUTONOMY

The Problem and Review of the Literature

Introduction

"Beefcake" or male cheesecake was the predominant image in TV programming in 1964. Males dominated females in TV in the number of appearances and in the varied roles portrayed by both sexes. For example, there were no female newscasters. Women were shown as passive and dependent while men were shown as strong in both commercials and situation comedies.[1] In 1974, McNeil analyzed sex-role stereotyping in TV dramatic programming and found women: 1) being underrepresented in the number of appearances; 2) occupying only certain sex-role stereotypic positions, such as housewife and secretary; and 3) being shown primarily as men's helpers.[2] Based on this research, a conclusion can be drawn: From 1964 to 1974, the images of women on television have not changed. Television is pervasive, with at least one set in 96.2%[3] of all American homes. Therefore, it is important to determine what effect this sex-role stereotyping is having on television viewers.

Research has examined the degree to which the sex-role stereotyped images have been perpetuated and what effects the images have had on people who view them, especially children. Bird summed up the concern of researchers regarding TV's sex-role image effects on children: "Our main quarrel with television is that it does not provide role models for a bright 13-year-old girl who would like to grow up to be something more than an ecstatic floor washer."[4] If by age 16 the average viewer will have spent 15,000

hours watching television, then concern over effects on children is not surprising.[5] Sex-role stereotyping does exist in children's female role models. What effect have the stereotyped images had on children's autonomy (independence of thought and action)? The current study will consider this question.

Sex-role Stereotyping in Children's Television

Examination of television's dramatic programming, during the time of day when TV is normally watched by children (late afternoons, evenings and Saturday mornings), has revealed that females are being shown in a manner unequal with men both in number of appearances and roles portrayed. Miller and Reeves report that almost three times as many men as women appear in TV roles. In addition, they found that men dominate the professional and more active (law enforcement, etc.) fields, while women were shown most often as housewives or in other traditional fields.[6] Long and Simon also found females to be underrepresented in dramatic programming. In addition, Long and Simon found women's image in family programs to be dependent on men and concerned with appearances of themselves and their homes.[7] O'Kelly found 85% of the 242 analyzed dramatic characters to be male, contrasted with 15% female. Ten percent were young boys cast in active roles, while 3% were young girls who portrayed passive characters.[8]

Television commercials aimed at children have also been examined for sex-role stereotyping. Verna found the female in children's TV ads to be passive and dependent on another person or object. She found male voice-overs to dominate and audio tracks designed

for males to be louder than those designed for females.[9] O'Kelly found 67% males and 33% females acting in the commercials during the time children normally watch television. Women in the ads were presented as housewives or in traditional roles, while girls in the ads were in female-type activities, such as "playing house or cooking". Men were shown in various occupations and boys were engaged in games or activities such as football, camping, playing with construction sets, etc.[10]

Even the cartoons have undergone scrutiny for sex-role stereotyping. Streicher found not only the females but also the males to be role-limited by the depiction of sex-roles in cartoons. Streicher observed that while there were several all-male cartoons, there were no all-female cartoons. She found females appeared less frequently, said fewer lines and occupied less important roles than the males in the series. Further, females had less responsibility and were shown as quieter, less intelligent and more immature than the males in the cartoons.[11] Busby found 42 occupations for males in the cartoons, but only nine traditional type job roles for females. Using a semantic differential scale, Busby found females in the cartoons to be less ambitious, less competitive, more submissive, more dependent on others and less individualistic when compared to the males.[12] Sternglanz and Serbin reported large differences in both the visibility and roles of the male and female characters in the cartoons. They also found that not only were the behaviors of the two sexes different (males more autonomous and adventurous, females more nurturant and motivated to avoid harm), but the females were more likely to be punished for showing a high degree of activity, while the males were more likely to be rewarded for

activity.[13]

A conclusion can be drawn from the content studies: TV sex-roles are traditional--men and women are being shown on television in roles which society has accepted for males and females respectively. Children who view television are seeing the sex-role stereotypes. If children are seeing the stereotypes on television, what are the potential socialization effects of the stereotypic images on children?

Modeling and Other Socialization Effects of Television on Children

One might question the value of findings supporting the perpetuation of sex-role stereotypes in children's television, were it not for the fact that children can be socialized by television. Researchers have suppoied evidence that children model or try to imitate behavior that they see on television. Paulos, Rubinstein and Liebert found that children who viewed the prosocial program showed significantly more desire to help others than those who saw neutral programs.[14] Kohlberg based his theory of sex-role development on learning of behavior mostly by observation, without a teacher/student interaction. He says that children structure their own perception of self-worth on a cognitive developmental level through modeling the behavior they see going on around them. Because of their desire to maintain self-worth, children have a tendency to model same-sex individuals. Therefore, children, according to Kohlberg, will model the behavior of people similar to themselves whom they see on television.[15] Greenberg, Heald, Wakshlag and Reeves found that

the child's perception of the TV character's goodness was more effective than perceived age, reality or humor as a predictor of the child's desire to model the character. Sexual similarity between the child and the TV character was also a predictor for boys, but not for girls. Boys wanted to model male characters; girls' desire to model a character was not based on sex similarity.[16] Reeves and Miller found in their data collected from third, fifth and seventh graders that boys identified more than girls with the entire set of characters chosen as a sample from television programs. They also found that girls are more likely to identify with male characters than boys are with female characters.[17]

A conclusion can be based on the modeling studies and the content analyses: Boys should find more models with more autonomy in their roles on television than girls.

Researchers have also found that the amount of TV viewing time affects the amount of sex-role socialization of the child. Freuh and McGhee found that elementary school viewers who watch a good deal of television (25 hours or more per week) were more sex-role stereotyped than light viewers of the same ages.[18] Beuf reported that regular TV viewers from three to six years of age expressed more stereotypical sex-role perceptions than those who viewed less television.[19]

Not only do children attempt to model what they see on TV and become more sex-typed as they watch more TV, but they are also affected by what has been called the "bombardment of images" effect. In sampling only male subjects, Robertson and Rossiter found that--although the results were modified somewhat by age, peer and parental variables--the boys who watched more advertisements

on television tended to request more advertised items for Christmas.[20] Rossiter and Robertson discovered, in another study, that while children have attitudinal and cognitive defenses to the commercials, the onslaught of pre-Christmas advertisements can break them down. Repeated exposure to the ads caused the children to request the advertised products.[21] Halpern states that toddlers (children less than three years of age) could be suffering ill effects (such as behavior disorders) from sensory overload created by TV commercials and programs like "Sesame Street." He cites observations of toddlers brought into a child guidance clinic for treatment who exhibited mannerisms such as the compulsive repeating of numbers and letters learned from "Sesame Street" at inappropriate times, thereby supporting his claim. He has also observed children outside the clinic who show the same types of behavior, but he observed that the behavior disorder must become serious enough to impair the child's functioning (such as inability to sleep) before the parents seek help.[22]

The conclusions to be drawn from these studies are children: 1) model behaviors they see on television; 2) become more sex-typed as they watch more TV; and 3) are affected by the "bombardment of images" effect. Therefore, not only are children possibly modeling the sex-role stereotyped images but they are also being influenced (bombarded) by the number of sex-role stereotypes being shown on television.

A crucial question in view of the literature reviewed so far seems to be: Do children perceive television's representation of sex-role stereotypes as real?

Children's Perceptions of TV Reality

Several studies have dealt with children's perceptions of television characters and television reality and how these perceptions vary with age and sex of the child. Reeves and Greenberg conducted a study to see how the dimensions of humor, masculine strength, feminine attractiveness and activity helped to define third, fifth and seventh graders' perceptions of and desire to model TV characters. They found there was no significant age difference in the number of dimensions children used to differentiate between TV characters. One plausible explanation for this finding is that children in the third grade are already socialized to TV's reality and have somewhat the same perceptions as the older children studied.[23] Greenberg and Reeves found the rating of television as real to be correlated with both age and intelligence of the child--the older and more intelligent a child was, the less likely he was to say television was real.[24] Hawkins found support for the development of "adult discount"[25] in that children in third grade no longer appear to believe in the reality of either TV characters or events. He also found that children of the youngest (four to five year-olds) and the oldest (sixth grade) ages he interviewed were skeptical of TV's usefulness in applying what happens on the screen to real-life, while the first and third graders responded that TV was useful in this capacity.[26] Collins found that children over ten years of age have the ability to separate motive and cause from the actions thay see on TV. He also states that children over ten distinguish between TV and the real world.[27] Comstock reports that by second grade, children have begun to mistrust and by the sixth grade, children mistrust all of what they see on TV.[28]

The conclusion from these findings can only be that young children (seven years and under) will be more likely to accept what they see on TV, while children over ten years of age should be able to apply what they have observed in real-life to the televised material. Therefore, children over age ten should be able to apply any non-traditional sex-role behaviors they have observed in real-life to what they see on television.

Based on the literature reviewed so far, another question appears to merit examination: How are the stereotypes being presented on television affecting children's perceptions of real-life sex-roles?

Sex-role Stereotyping and Childrens' Perceptions

Given that sex-role stereotyping is present in children's TV content and that children are being affected by it, some research has concentrated on children's perceptions of real-life sex-roles. Miller and Reeves found that: 1) boys nominated more televised characters as models for their behavior than girls; 2) boys nominated more same-sex characters to serve as their models than did girls; and 3) generally, children who were exposed to female characters in counter-stereotypic roles and who were able to identify the female were more likely to perceive those occupations as appropriate for women in real life.[29] Because the children generally chose highly stereotyped people of their own sex as models, the teaching or reinforcement of sex-role by TV was supported.[30] Beuf used interviews and the "OK Picture Game" with 63 children between the ages of three and six and concluded that:

1) boys chose more adventurous careers for themselves than girls; 2) over 70% of the boys and 73% of the girls chose stereotypical careers for themselves; and 3) all children rated male tasks higher than female tasks.[31]

The idea that children who see non-traditional roles on TV could begin to think in non-traditional terms themselves is suggested by Scherer's research. Scherer found that exposure to a counter-stereotypical movie resulted in improved evaluations of the dark-haired, dark-eyed actors from a group of German adults and college students who had previously given good evaluations only to light-haired people.[32]

In support of the idea that children who have seen examples of non-traditional sex-roles in their lives may be able to apply them to what they see on TV, the Hawkins, Morelli, Pingree, and Wilson study merits consideration. They found that children with a working mother were less likely to consider attractiveness important, especially if the mother held a non-traditional (traditionally male) job. They also found attractiveness to be less important as a dimension of comparison for children who believed that a woman could independent and her appearance was no more important than that of a man. They concluded that the non-television models were more influential on children's perceptions.[33]

These studies show that sex-role stereotyping in TV is contributing to children's stereotyped perceptions of themselves. Young girls who watch TV have few role models compared to the boys who watch. For this reason, it seems likely that: 1)children who view non-traditional roles on TV should be more likely to consider

non-traditional roles for themselves; and 2) children who view traditional roles on TV should be more likely to consider traditional roles for themselves.

If sex-role stereotyping in children's TV content is contributing to children's sex-role stereotyped perceptions of themselves, is the stereotyping also affecting them in the area of autonomy? Sex-role stereotyping and autonomy have been shown to be related by several researchers. Though his study dealt with college students, Strumpfer found males to be higher in autonomous values than females.[34] Tangri, although also dealing with college students, found one of the major determinants of occupational role innovation (entering a previously male-dominated field) to be autonomy.[35] Bem, still dealing with college students, found that "feminine" females were lower in autonomy and independence than either males of androgynous females. Bem et al. define an "androgynous female" as one who possesses psychological characteristics of both males and females.[36] Golightly, Nelson and Johnson found females to be more dependent than males in their study of grade school children.[37] A series of studies conducted in 1968 by Inge K. Broverman and others at Worchester State Hospital in Massachusetts, as reported in Guttentag and Bray, revealed that a "double standard" exists for men and women in the area of healthy traits to possess for each sex, respectively, as rated by male and female psychologists. Male-valued items included "very independent", while female-valued items included "not at all independent."[38]

Autonomy (independence of thought and action) has been shown by the sex-role research to be linked to female stereotyping. The relationship is one reason autonomy was isolated as the dependent variable in this study. The other reason resulted from a careful

reading of previous research in this area.[39] Autonomy is fairly exclusive to males' roles as they are depicted on television. If televised sex-role stereotypes are affecting children's sex-role perceptions of themselves, girls may feel that there is something wrong with them if they are autonomous. Are sex-role stereotypes depicted on television related to children's real-life autonomy? This question has not been answered by previous studies.

Based on the literature reviewed and the relationships pointed out, the following hypotheses are advanced regarding the outcome of the current study:

H_1 Children who view programs with non-traditional sex-roles will be more likely to achieve high scores on the autonomy scale than either the children who view traditional roles or the controls.

H_2 Boys will be more likely than girls to achieve high scores on the autonomy scale.

H_3 Children in fifth grade will score higher on the autonomy scale than children in the first or second grades.

H_4 Boys who view non-traditional sex-roles will be more likely to achieve high scores on the autonomy scale than girls or boys in any other treatment group.

H_5 Children in fifth grade who view non-traditional sex-roles will be more likely to achieve high scores on the autonomy scale than children in any other age or treatment group.

H_6 Boys in the fifth grade will be more likely to achieve high scores on the autonomy scale than girls in that or any other age group.

Methodology

Subjects

Subjects for the current study were students at Metcalf Laboratory School, Normal, Illinois, during second semester, 1978. Six classes with 20 students per class participated; the total N was 120. One section each of first, second, third and sixth grades

as well as two sections of fifth grade took part. The age ranges cited were chosen to insure that the age difference needed for testing the third hypothesis existed. With the exceptions of the third and sixth grade classes who served as controls, the classes were randomly assigned to one of the two experimental conditions.

Procedures

The pretest was conducted during the week of April 17, 1978. The experiment and posttesting took place during the week of May 15, using intact classes randomly assigned to experimental conditions. Two trained coders assisted during the pretest phase and two trained coders assisted during the posttest phase.

Pretest for Sex-role Stereotyping

In order to control the number of subjects both high and low in sex-role stereotyping, a pretest was administered. The pretest used in this study was the Games and Activities Checklist developed by Lefkowitz.[40] The test is an alternate choice checklist, with eleven item pairs, each pair composed of a female stereotypic choice and a male stereotypic choice. The item-test correlations for the eleven items were reported by Lefkowitz to be significant at the .01 level. Further testing of the instrument revealed 9 items to be a valid measure of male stereotypic response and 7 items to measure sex-role preference for females. Five of the items were common to both sexes.

Scores on the subjects' pretests were compared to the standard male stereotypic and female stereotypic scores to determine high and low scorers for assignment to groups.

Subjects were brought as a class to the room where the

equipment was located. Then the subjects were asked not to laugh or talk to their neighbors, but just to watch the tapes. Following this the tapes were presented.

All mediated models were females from currently available, familiar TV series selected from the time frame explained earlier.

Traditional. Subjects in the traditional group viewed an eight-minute videotape composed of two segments. The first segment was a tape of Edith Bunker of "All in the Family" shown in the kitchen and begging Archie to take her out to dinner in a traditional manner. The second segment was a tape of Marian Cunningham from "Happy Days" shown doing chores around the house and doing the bidding of family members also in a traditional manner.

Non-traditional. Subjects in the non-traditional group viewed an eight-minute videotape composed of two segments. The first segment was a tape of "Wonder Woman" showing her change from an ordinary person in "Wonder Woman" prior to single-handedly rounding up all of the criminals responsible for the crime in question. The second segment was a tape of "Isis" also showing her change from an ordinary schoolteacher into the mighty "Isis" prior to rescuing a young man caught in an underwater reef.

Control. Subjects in the control group saw no videotapes. They were merely pretested, then posttested.

Posttest

The fifth grade subjects remained in the room following the presentation to fill out the Children's Dependency Scale. The experimenter read a standard list of instructions prior to each administration of the test to a class. This was done to insure uniformity in presentation of the tests and to help eliminate bias.

The first and second grade subjects were returned to their classrooms and brought back to be interviewed individually by the experimenter and the trained coders. All interviewers read standard instructions to each child before administering the test and each interview was conducted in a standardized manner.

All subjects were posttested on the Children's Dependency Scale developed by Golightly, Nelson and Johnson.[41] Scores on the original scale which measured dependency were reversed to provide a measure of autonomy which has been defined for the purposes of this study as independence of thought and action. The scale is a questionnaire in true-false format. Though the actual questionnaire consists of 65 items, validity testing of the instrument revealed 33 cross tabulated items. These 33 items were used in tabulating final scores for the subjects.

Test-retest reliability (two weeks time lapse) was reported by the authors to be .67 for fourth graders, .87 for fifth graders, and .82 for sixth graders.

Results

Scores on the pretest, The Games and Activities Checklist, developed by Monroe Lefkowitz, served as a baseline for grouping the subjects into the traditional, non-traditional or control groups. Scoring was standard as reported by Lefkowitz.[42] Table 1 (in Appendix) illustrates the breakdown of highs and lows by group.

The variable, sex-role stereotyping, was relatively equally distributed in the groups. The approximately equal distribution of both high and low scorers among the groups led to the conclusion that there was a consistent influence of sex-role stereotyping across groups.

Scoring of the Posttest

The 33 cross-validated items, discovered by Golightly, Nelson and Johnson in their testing of the Children's Dependency Scale[43] were used as the posttest in this study. Each statement gave the child two alternatives: was the item "true" for him or "false" for him? All items were initially scored with "1" for a true response and "2" for a false response. In order to obtain a 34-point scale ranging from 33 to 66, those responses where the answer which represented autonomy was "true" were scored as "2" rather than "1". The 34-point scale was created to allow equal intervals between all responses representing autonomy and all responses representing dependency. The maximum score, representing autonomy was 66, and the lowest possible score, representing dependency was 33. The scores achieved on the posttest by the subjects ranged from 40 to 66 out of the possible range of 33 to 66.

Hypothesis Testing

The six hypotheses posited earlier in the paper have been tested. For all tests, the level of statistical significance was considered to be $p < .05$.

The First Hypothesis

One-way analysis of variance was employed to test the null hypothesis for H_1 (Table 2). The three groups, representing the traditional (Group I), non-traditional (Group II) and control (Group III) treatment conditions were used as the independent variable; the scores on the autonomy scale achieved by members of the respective groups were the dependent variable.

The results were statistically significant at the $p < .05$

level, but the control group had the highest mean. The Duncan Range analysis revealed that only Group III had a mean significantly higher than that of Group II. Neither the means of Group II and Group I nor the means of Group I and Group III were significantly different. As the high scores were not in the direction predicted, H_1 is not supported.

Because of the possibility that the difference in sex-role stereotyping (baseline scores) could have resulted in the observed difference in posttest scores, an analysis of covariance was performed to see if the pretest scores explained the variance. The baseline scores were used as the covariate independent variable with the treatment conditions; scores on the posttest were the dependent variable (Table 3).

The covariate (baseline scores) was not significant. Thus, the difference in baseline scores does not fully explain the variance between groups.

The Second Hypothesis

To test the null hypothesis for H_2, one-tailed t-test procedures were used to determine the difference between scores obtained on the autonomy scale by males and females (Table 4).

There was a significant difference between the means at the $p < .05$ level. Boys did score higher than girls.

The Third Hypothesis

One-tailed t-test procedures were again utilized to test the difference between the means of the scores obtained on the scale by the younger (6-8) and older (11, 12) subjects in the study (Table 5).

The difference between the means is significant at the $p < .05$

level. Older subjects scored higher on the scale than younger subjects did.

The Fourth Hypothesis

H_1, H_2, and H_3 predicted main effects for treatment, sex and age respectively. H_4 predicts a first order interaction between sex and group. To discern whether or not the relationship existed as predicted, a two-way analysis of variance was performed testing scores on the autonomy scale across three levels of group and two levels of sex (Table 6).

As indicated in Table 6, main effects for both group and sex were significant at $p < .05$, but the interaction between the two variables did not yield a significant F ratio at the $p < .05$ level. The Duncan range analysis again shows that Group III is the only group with a mean significantly higher than Group II--neither the means of Group II--neither the means of Group II and Group I nor the means of Group I and Croup III were significantly different.

The Fifth Hypothesis

H_5 predicts a first order interaction between age and group. In order to determine whether or not the relationship was as predicted, a two-way analysis of variance was done testing scores on the autonomy scale across three levels of group and two levels of age. The analysis results are presented in Table 7.

The interaction between age and group was significant at the $p < .05$ level.

To determine the sources of the variance, descriptive separate cell analysis was performed. The results are in Table 8. The separate cell analysis shows a larger mean for the older children in Group I and thus confirms the support of H_5.

The Sixth Hypothesis

H_6 predicts an interaction between sex and age. To determine whether or not the relationship existed as predicted, a two-way analysis was done testing scores on the scale across two levels of sex and two levels of age (Table 9).

The interaction between sex and age was not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations For Future Research

Discussion

The first hypothesis, predicting a main effect for the non-traditional treatment (that those who saw the non-traditional tape segments would score higher on the autonomy scale) was not supported. This finding can be explained in three primary ways. First, the effects of age as a variable obviously obscured a treatment effect in this study; the oldest children had the highest scores. In fact, they significantly outscored the younger children on the Children's Dependency Scale. The older children appeared to be more autonomous regardless of treatment. The youngest children in the current study (first graders) were randomly assigned to the non-traditional treatment group and their scores were the lowest of all classes. Even though the older males in the non-traditional group has one of the highest means, the first graders' mean was probably sufficient to lower the group mean to the level where a treatment effect could not be found.

A second plausible explanation is that sex also became an obscuring variable to the treatment effect. Generally, males achieved higher scores than females. Perhaps the idea that sex-

role stereotyping is pervasive in this society[44] helps to explain why males score higher in autonomy than females, or this could be one area where TV programming is having a socializing effect. The review of the literature[45] points out that males on TV are shown as more autonomous and this study found support for the idea that real-life young males are indeed more autonomous.

A third reason why this study found no main treatment effect was the use of non-traditional role models who still were sex-role stereotyped in the manner of their dress. Though dress is a less obvious form of sex-role stereotyping than dependency, the clothing worn by "Isis" and "Wonder Woman" might have caused the subjects in the non-traditional group to view the models as sex-role stereotyped. As sex-role stereotyping is discussed by Bem and Bem,[46] even the slightest hint of the variable may cause a nonconscious linking to an entire set of variable related behaviors. Therefore, subjects might have nonconsciously reacted as though a more blatant form of the variable was being presented. Finding more suitable role models for the non-traditional videotapes proved impossible so the models selected were used. Television programming will nopefully offer more autonomous female role models in usual clothing in the future so that this problem can be eliminated.

The support of the second hypothesis--males scored higher on the autonomy scale than females--supports findings of other research in this area.[47] The finding also lends validity to the instrument chosen for the current study as males scored lower than females on the original Children's Dependency Scale and that result was supported in this study.

The third hypothesis was also supported by the finding that

older children scored higher than younger children on the autonomy scale. The older children significantly outscoring the younger children is perhaps the most interesting finding of this study. This finding supports Hawkins'[48] and others idea of the development of "adult discount," that as children get older they consider TV less credible as a gauge for real-life people and events. Possibly, the older children with the higher scores (regardless of group) relied more on their own perceptions and other influences, as the Hawkins, Lorelli, Pingree and Wilson[49] data suggests.

The fourth hypothesis--the interaction between sex and group--was not supported. This finding can possibly be explained by the idea that while treatment had an effect in the opposite direction than that which had been predicted, males were higher scorers in all groups. Therefore, a significant interaction could have failed to occur because the means in all male groups were not statistically different.

The support of the fifth hypothesis--that fifth graders in the non-trational group would score higher than younger children in that or any age group--also lends support to "adult discount". The crucial factor in this analysis may have been the females' scores, as it has already been noted that the males all scored higher. Perhaps the fifth grade non-traditional females could relate to the autonomy of "Isis" and "Wonder Woman" in a more abstract way than younger children. It is possible that the older girls viewed the models as autonomous people, overlooking their manner of dress, while the younger subjects simply disregarded the autonomy factor in favor of noticing the models' sex-role stereotyped dress and generalizing the manner of dress to behaviors, as the

"adult discount" phenomena suggests they might.

The sixth hypothesis--the sex and age interaction--was aoso unsupported. On the basis of Hawkins' "adult discount" idea and the results of Miller and Reeves' and Beuf's studies,[50] which found males to be more likely to make more autonomous career choices for themselves, age and sex might have significantly interacted. Again, age was the predominate variable, with older females outscoring younger males.

Conclusions

Although the current study found no treatment effect, it should not be concluded that such an effect could not be found in a similar study. The overwhelming effects of age and sex which occluded a treatment effect here can be more tightly controlled to produce a clearer observation of condition effect in future studies.

The support for the hypothesis--older children scored higher than younger children--lends added validity to the "adult discount" idea.

The support for the hypotheses--males scored higher than females, older children scored higher than younger children--suggests that females and younger children are being most affected by sex-role stereotyping on TV in the area of autonomy development.

Future research can further support or negate these conclusions and add other important development variables to the emerging matrix of TV socialization effects.

Recommendations for Future Research

The area of effects of TV programming on children has received a good deal of research attention. Studies have been conducted

to content analyze the programming and others have looked at children's modeling tendencies, reality perception, etc. However, as the literature review in this paper explains, there are few studies dealing with children's actual perceptions or behaviors as a result of viewing TV violence, sex-role stereotyping or other potential socialization components. If television is having a socializing effect on children, it is directly affecting their perceptions and behavior. Perceptions and behavior resulting from TV use are the variables future research must consider. Obviously, many outside socializing forces intervene (parent influence, peer infludnce, outside groups and activities), but even these can be examined to form a general picture of the role TV plays in socializing young people.

Considering TV's presentation of sex-role stereotyping and its subsequent effect on children, two main areas appear to need study. The first is the study of children's perceptions of others as a result of viewing TV sex-role stereotyping. How do children generalize the sex-role stereotypes they see on TV to real life? Does this perception of others change over time as "adult discount" suggests it might? These are only two questions from the maze of TV's sex-role stereotyping, socializing effects which need to be clearly classified and better understood by future researchers.

The second area which needs consideration is the effects of TV's sex-role stereotyping on children's perceptions of themselves. More studies along the line of the current study need to be done to determine how children perceive themselves with several varieties of dependent variables over a period of time while viewing TV's sex-role stereotypic presentation.

Finally, longitudinal research appears to be needed to discover how subjects change over time in their perceptions and behaviors. Panel studies would clearly help to discredit or uphold ideas like "adult discount." Sampling subjects at different times in their lives would provide a clearer picture of trends in their perceptions.

In summary, future research needs to vary the variables manipulated in this study to look at the child's self perception, and to expand the number of dependent variables to study the child's perception of self and others as a result of TV's socializing influence.

Endnotes

[1]"Looking Back on the Women's Movement," The Sunday Pantagraph, 25 September 1977, sec. 3, p. 1.

[2]Jean M. McNeil, "Feminism, Feminity and TV," Journal of Broadcasting 19 (Summer 1975), 268.

[3]Christopher H. Sterling and John M. Kittross, Stay Tuned: A Concise History of American Broadcasting (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973) p. 535.

[4]Caroline Bird, "What's Television Doing for 50.9% of Americans?" TV Guide, February 1971, p. 6.

[5]Alberta E. Siegal, "Communicating with the Next Generation," Journal of Communication (Autumn 1975): 22.

[6]Mark L. Miller and Byron Reeves, "Dramatic TV Content and Children's Sex-Role Stereotypes," Journal of Broadcasting 20 (Winter 1976): 40-41.

[7]Michelle L. Long and Rita J. Simon, "The Roles and Statuses of Women on Children and Family TV Programs," Journalism Quarterly 51 (Spring 1974): 110.

[8]Charlotte G. O'Kelly, "Sexism in Children's TV Commercials," Journalism Quarterly 52 (Fall 1975): 723.

[9]Mary Ellen Verna, "The Female Image in Children's TV Commercials," Journal of Broadcasting 19 (Summer 1975): 305-307.

[10]Ibid. "Sexism in Children's . . ." (O'Kelly), p. 723.

[11]Helen White Streicher, "The Girls in the Cartoons," Journal of Communication 24 (Spring 1974): 125-129.

[12]Linda Jean Busby, "Defining the Sex-Role Standard in Network Children's Programs," Journalism Quarterly 51 (Winter 1974): 692 and 693.

[13]Sarah H. Sternglanz and Lisa A. Serbin, "Sex-Role Stereotyping in Children's Television Programs," Developmental Psychology 10 (September 1974): 713-714.

[14]Rita Wicks Paulos, Eli A. Rubenstein and Robert M. Liebert, "Positive Social Learning," Journal of Communication 25 (Autumn 1975): 90-97.

[15]Lawrence Kohlberg, "A Cognitive-Developmental Analysis of Children's Sex-Role Concepts and Attitudes," in The Development of Sex Differences, ed. Eleanor Maccoby (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press) pp. 82-173.

[16]Bradley Greenberg, Gary Heald, Jacob Rakshlag and Byron Reeves, "TV Character Attributes, Identification and Children's Modeling Tendencies," paper presented to the Mass Comm. Division, International Communication Association, Portland, April, 1976.

Endnotes

[17]Byron Reeves and Mark M. Miller, "Distance in a Multi-Dimensional Space as a Measure of Sex Differences in Children's Identification with Television Characters, " paper presented to the Mass Comm. Division, International Communication Association, Portland, April, 1976.

[18]Terry Freuh and Paul E. McGhee, "Traditional Sex-Role Development and Amount of Time Spent Watching Television," Developmental Psychology 11 (January 1975): 109.

[19]Ann Beuf, "Doctor, Lawyer, Household Drudge," Journal of Communication 24 (Spring 1974): 144.

[20]Thomas S. Robertson and John R. Rossiter, "Children's Responsiveness to Commercials," Journal of Communication 27 (Autumn 1977): 105.

[21]John R. Rossiter and Thomas S. Robertson, "children's TV Commercials: Testing the Defenses," Journal of Communication 24 (Autumn 1974): 142.

[22]Werner I. Halpern, "Turned-on Toddlers," Journal of Communication 25 (Autumn 1975): 45-48.

[23]Byron Reeves and Bradley S. Greenberg, "Children's Perceptions of Television Characters," Human Communication Research 3 (Winter 1977): 113-124.

[24]Bradley S. Greenberg and Byron Reeves, "Children and the Perceived Reality of Television," Journal of Social Issues 32 (1976): 89-96.

[25]Robert Parker Hawkins, "The Dimensional Structure of Children's Perceptions of Television Reality," Communication Research 4 (July 1977): 311.

[26]Ibid. "The Dimensional . . ." (Hawkins), pp. 311-317.

[27]W. Andrew Collins, "The Developing Child as Viewer," Journal of Communication 25 (Autumn 1975): 35-44.

[28]George Comstock, "The Evidence So Far," Journal of Communication 25 (Autumn 1975): 25-34.

[29]The means of two of the dependent measures failed to support the third finding.

[30]Ibid. "Dramatic TV Content . . ." (Miller and Reeves), pp. 43-49.

[31]Ibid. "Doctor, Lawyer . . ." (Beuf), p. 145.

[32]Klaus R. Scherer, "Stereotype Change Following Exposure to Counter-stereotypical Media Heroes," Journal of Broadcasting 15 (Winter 1970-1971): 94-99.

Endnotes

[33]Robert P. Hawkins, Christine Morelli, Suzanne Pingree and Donna G. Wilson, "How Children Evaluate Real-Life and Television Women," paper presented to the Comm. Theory and Methodology Division, Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism, Madison, Wisconsin., August 1977.

[34]D.J. W. Strumpfer, "Scales to Measure Autonomous and Social Achievement Values," Psychological Reports 35 (Spring 1975): 194.

[35]Sandra Schwartz Tangri, "Determinants of Occupational Role Innovation Among College Women," Journal of Social Issues 28 (Spring 1975): 194.

[36]Sandra L. Bem, "Sex Typing and Androgyny: Further Explorations of the Expressive Domain," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 34 (November 1976): 1019-1023.

[37]Carole Golightly, Don Nelson, and James Johnson, "Children's Dependency Scale," Developmental Psychology 3 (1970): 114-118.

[38]Marcia Guttentag and Helen Bray, Undoing Sex Stereotypes, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1976), pp. 182-184.

[39]For example, see Long and Simon, Streicher, Busby, Sternglanz and Servin, previously reported in this review.

[40]Monroe M. Lefkowitz, "Some Relationships Between Sex Role Preference of Children and Other Parent and Child Variables," Psychological Reports 10 (1962): 47.

[41]Ibid. "Children's Dependency . . ." (Golightly et. al.), pp. 114.

[42]Ibid. "Some Relationships Between . . ." (Lefkowitz), p. 47.

[43]Ibid. "Children's Dependency . . ." (Golightly er. al.) p. 114.

[44]Sandra Bem and Daryl Bem, "We're all Nonconscious Sexist," Psychology Today, May 1970, pp. 22-24.

[45]See Long and Simon, Ver, Streicher, Busby Sternglanz and Ser in, previously noted in this review.

[46]Ibid. "We're All Nonconscious . . ." (Bem and Bem), pp. 22-24.

[47]See Golightly, Nelson and Johnson and Miller and Reeves previously reported in this review.

[48]See Hawkins previously reported in this review.

[49]Ibid. "How Children Evaluate . . ." (Hawkins et.al.).

[50]See Hawkins, Miller and Reeves and Beuf previously reported.

TABLE 1

RESULTS OF BASELINE TEST FOR SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPING

	Group I Traditional	Group II Non-traditional	Group III Control
High	21	21	19
Low	19	19	21
Total	40	40	40

N = 120

TABLE 2

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TREATMENT

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$\bar{x}$	f	p
Between Ss						
Group I (traditional)				52.0		
Group II (non-traditional)	117	392.34	196.17	49.7	6.41	.002
Group III (control)				54.1		
Within Ss	2	3578.84	30.58			
Total	119	3971.18			6.41	.002

Duncan Range = 3.91

N for each group = 40

N = 120

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TREATMENT WITH BASELINE SCORES

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	f	p
Covariate	1	101.75	101.75	3.38	.06
Group Main Effect	2	382.60	191.30	6.36	.002
Explained	3	484.36	161.45	5.37	.002
Residual	116	3486.79	30.05		
Total	119	3971.15	33.37		

N = 120

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF T-TEST FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SEXES

Groups	$\bar{x}$	df	t	p
Females	50.7	118	-2.35	0.02
Males	53.1			

N for each group = 60

N = 120

TABLE 5

RESULTS OF T-TEST FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AGES

Groups	$\bar{x}$	df	t	p
6-8	48.7	118	-7.22	0.000
11,12	55.1			

N for each group = 40

N = 120

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TREATMENT BY SEX

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	f	p
Group	2	392.31	196.15	6.61	.002
by					
Sex	1	117.63	177.63	5.99	.016
2 way interaction	2	22.51	11.25	0.38	.685
Explained	5	592.46	118.49	3.99	.002
Residual	114	3378.68	29.63		
Total	119	3971.15	33.37		

Duncan Range = 3.2

p .01

N for each group = 40
Nfor each sex = 60
N = 120

TABLE 7

RESULTS OF TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TREATMENT BY AGE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	f	p
Group	2	392.31	196.15	10.06	.000
by					
Age	1	1216.03	1216.03	63.37	.000
2 way interaction	2	140.41	70.20	3.60	.03
Explained	5	1748.76	349.75	17.94	.000
Residual	114	2222.38	19.69		
Total	119	3971.15	33.37		

TABLE 8

SEPARATE CELL ANALYSIS FOR TREATMENT BY AGE

	$\bar{x}$	Min.	Max.	Range	Variance
Group I					
6-8	50	41	58	17	19.208
11, 12	54	47	60	13	20.421
Group II					
6-8	45	40	51	11	11.524
11, 12	54.25	44	61	17	26.092
Group III					
6-8	51	42	60	18	20.095
11, 12	57	49	63	14	19.629

N for each group = 40
N for each age = 60
N = 120

TABLE 9

RESULTS OF TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SEX BY AGE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	f	p
Sex	1	121.61	121.61	5.36	.02
by					
Age	1	1160.01	1160.01	51.20	.00
2 way interaction	1	5.37	5.37	0.23	.62
Explained	3	1343.01	447.67	19.75	.00
Residual	116	2628.13	22.65		
Total	119	3971.15	33.37		

N for each sex = 60

N for each age = 60

N = 120